

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

NED BRUEN,

Petitioner,

vs.

CRAIG FARWELL, *et al.*,

Respondents.

3:02-cv-00148-LRH-RAM

**ORDER**

This is a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court entered judgment for respondents on September 1, 2009. On September 25, 2009, petitioner filed a notice of appeal and a motion for a certificate of appealability. (Docket #81, 82.)

In order to proceed with his appeal, petitioner must receive a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); Fed. R. App. P. 22; 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. R. 22-1; *Allen v. Ornoski*, 435 F.3d 946, 950-951 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006); *see also United States v. Mikels*, 236 F.3d 550, 551-52 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001). Generally, a petitioner must make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right” to warrant a certificate of appealability. *Id.*; 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). “The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” *Id.* (*quoting Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484). In order to meet this threshold inquiry, the petitioner has the burden of demonstrating that the issues are debatable among jurists of reason; that a court could resolve the issues differently; or that the questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Id.*

This court has considered the issues raised by petitioner with respect to whether they satisfy

1 the standard for issuance of a certificate of appealability and determines that none meet that standard.

2 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's motion for a certificate of appealability is  
3 **DENIED.** (Docket #82.)

4 DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2009.



---

LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE